

July 18, 2001

Members of the Planning Commission:

My name is Peggy King. My husband and I have lived at 6901 North 148th Street since 1986. We are members of the group known as "CARS". Citizens for Accountable Route Selection. I appreciate the opportunity to speak at this hearing today.

Like all of you, we have stacks of reports and documents along with newspaper clippings and maps. We have read and re-read every article and new piece of information to come out. We have attended information meetings and hearings. Representatives of government departments and the consulting firm have been helpful and responsive to our requests.

We were pleased early in the process when EF-1 was eliminated as a viable route because of the distance from Lincoln, greater cost, and historical impacts. We felt the reasons were logical. Needless to say, we were quite surprised in June of 1997 when EF-1 went from being eliminated, to the route selected in December of 1998. As far as we could tell, nothing in the technical data had changed, so what happened? At a meeting in December, 1998, one of the City Council Members at the time commented that since we can't decide where to put it, let's just put it out as far as possible.

It is truly a pleasure to see that "accountability" and careful review of the data by the planning department staff has taken place over that type of voting. Once again the far route (EF-1) is being recommended for denial in Comp Plan Amendment #94-63 just as it was early in the beltway review process.

After the unexplainable vote by the SuperCommons at their meeting in June of 1997 to drop EC-1 and return EF-1 to the consideration, we contacted our neighbors in the corridor and a group of citizens met for the first time in June of 1997 with similar concerns and one goal.... that the route selection be **ACCOUNTABLE**. Members of our group have been diligent in writing letters and testifying at every possible opportunity to make elected officials aware of the facts about EF-1. We feel that the whole process has come full circle with the latest recommendation of the planning commission staff. Taxpayers will be pleased that the nearly \$2 million dollars spent on the process by local government bodies has not been wasted.

Others who have testified before me have highlighted parts of the planning commission reports that are important to have in the official record including quotes from the proposed amendments that **"it (EF-1) will not adequately address internal traffic relief or serve as a multiple use corridor as well as other routes.... Since the East Far is 3-4 miles distance from the city, to complete the road network leading the beltway intersections will require the additional costs to pave and improve existing rural section roads. East Far has more environmental impacts than East Middle, and has more residential relocations; more visual and more noise impacts than East**

Exhibit 30
July 18, 2001

Middle. The East Far route would also bisect a high quality area of native prairie north of Havelock Avenue."

My husband and I, along with our neighbors, fully support the recommendation of the Planning Staff that Comp Plan Amendment #94-63 relating to EF-1 should be denied and Comp Plan Amendment #94-64 relating to EM-1 be approved.

Finally, I feel it is important to reply also to those who have suggested that 148th be used as an alternative. Since it is not even one of the options presented at this hearing today, it doesn't seem like an option we should be concerned with. However, I would like to refer to the **DEIS page 2.45 Section 2.3.8 - Consideration of 148th Street Alignments** – "At the end of the Level III analysis, the study team was requested to evaluate to additional scenarios – a beltway alternative along 148th Street and a non-beltway alternative along 148th Street. Although an alternative along 148th Street had been included previously in the universe of alternatives, it had been eliminated during the Level II analysis along with all other alignments along section line roads due to the required frontage roads and higher level of impacts to existing rural residences along these roads." As two of the speakers discussed last Wednesday night, the number residences affected would be more than 80. Which is a greater number than all of those affected if all three routes were combined! There should be no doubt about further consideration of this option.

We would like to commend the planning staff for their thorough compilation of these reports and fully support the recommendation to deny inclusion of EF-1 as a Comp Plan Amendment and approve EM-1 as Comp Plan Amendment #94-64.

Thank you.

Peggy & Jim King
6901 North 148th Street
Lincoln, NE 68527
(402) 786-3666